

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 15 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8, and replace the original sheets including Figs. 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8.

In Figure 1, the reference number for "Network" has been changed from 24 to 6; the reference number for "Processor" has been changed from 21 to 11; and the reference number for "Import Agent" has been changed from 26 to 10.

In Figure 2, reference numbers 52 and 54 has been added for consistency with Figure 3 and with the specification.

In Figure 5, the reference number for "Determine if Reference Data File Specified" has been changed from 73 to 9; the reference number for "Uncompress Reference Data File" has been changed from 75 to 8, and the reference number for "Read ADO information for data elements and related data elements in reference data file" has been changed from 77 to 7.

In Figure 6, the reference number for "Entity Type" has been changed from 44 to 5.

In Figure 8, "Intern" has been replaced with "Item" at step 122; and "Determine whether Data Item exists in Target Database" has been replaced with "Insert Data Item into Target Database" at step 126.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (5 pages)
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes (5 pages)

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 16 of 22

Attorney's Docket No. : 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 16 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 14, 2006, rejected all pending claims 1-20, and also objected to the drawings. In response, Applicants have amended above the drawings, the specification, and claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15 and 19, and have canceled claims 3, 5, 9, 11-12 and 17-18. As such, claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10, 13-16, and 19-20 remain pending. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Applicants also request that the Patent Office consider the references that were submitted in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 31, 2006, and further request that an initialed copy of the corresponding PTO-1449 form be returned with the next communication from the Patent Office.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference interview of October 12, 2006, during which amendments to claim 1 and the cited reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757 to Multer et al. ("Multer"), were discussed. Present at the interview were Supervisor Jeffrey Gaffin and Examiner Paul Kim.

Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings because of various typographical errors. Applicants have made the following amendments to the drawings and the specification to address the objections. First, Applicants have corrected the duplicative reference number 21, which refers to a processor, in Fig. 1 and in the specification by changing the reference number to 11. Second, Applicants have corrected the duplicative reference number 26, which refers to an import agent, in Fig. 1 and in the specification by changing the reference number to 10. Third, Applicants have corrected the duplicative reference number 73, which refers to "determine if reference data file is specified," in Fig. 5 and in the specification by changing the reference number to 9. Fourth, Applicants have corrected the duplicative reference number 75, which refers to "uncompress reference data file," in Fig. 5 and in the specification by changing the

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 17 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

reference number to 8. Fifth, Applicants have corrected the duplicative reference number 77, which refers to "read ADO information for data elements and related data elements in reference data file," in Fig. 5 and in the specification by changing the reference number to 7. Sixth, Applicants have amended the specification paragraph that begins at page 16, line 27, to include reference number 103, which refers to the reset filter button in Fig. 6. Seventh, Applicants have amended the specification, as well as Figures 2, 6 and 8 to correct additional typographical errors. Applicants submit that the amendments add no new matter, and ask that the Examiner remove the objections to the drawings.

The Office Action also objected to the drawings because of various handwritten characters and a lack of directional arrows in Fig. 5. Applicants submit that formal drawings, filed on January 14, 2005, and received by the Office on January 18, 2005, overcome these objections, and Applicants ask that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings.

Corrected drawing sheets are being submitted with this amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 5-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Multer. Of these, claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, 13-16 and 19-20 remain pending, and claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent. Applicants submit that each of the independent claims, as amended above, defines subject matter that is patentable over Multer. The fact that Applicants distinguish Multer from Applicants' claimed subject matter should not be taken as an admission that Applicants concede that Multer is properly considered prior art under any sub-section of 35 U.S.C. 102.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original dependent claims 3 and 5, and to clarify the nature of the relationship between the related data element and the at least one data element. For example, the related data element affects a layout of the at least one data element. Dependent claims 4 and 6 have been amended for consistency with amended claim 1. These amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments can be

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 18 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

found throughout the originally filed specification, including, for example, claims 3 and 5 as originally filed, at page 5, lines 21-26; at page 13, line 32 to page 14, line 8; and in Fig. 5.

Multer discloses a system and method for synchronizing devices. (Abstract). Given first and second systems A and B, a differencing transmitter 100 extracts information from system A and converts the information extracted into difference information. (Col. 6, lines 6-8). Difference information comprises only the changes to system B's data which have occurred on system B. (Col. 6, lines 8-10). Only the difference information will be transmitted between systems. (Col. 6, lines 20-24). Differencing receiver 102 will interpret the difference information and reconstruct the binary files on system B. (Col. 6, lines 26-28). In this manner, the information on system B is updated without the need to transfer the entire binary files between the systems. (Col. 6, lines 28-30).

Multer does not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter set forth in Applicants' amended claim 1. For example, Multer fails to disclose or suggest, as recited in amended claim 1, a method that includes accessing a related data element from the source database, the related data element affecting a layout of the at least one data element, and copying the at least one data element and the related data element to an export data file. The Office Action contended, in connection with its rejection of claim 3, that Multer discloses "differencing transmitter extracts such information from System A and converts the information extracted into difference information." This, however, is not a related data element as recited in Applicants' amended claim 1. Multer is concerned with synchronizing personal information, as opposed to synchronizing and updating business information, across devices, and Multer does not discuss related data elements at all. In fact, the entities that Multer describes are single-level entities such as "calendar," "contact item," and "task item," (Fig. 13), which do not include defined dependencies to any related data elements.

Moreover, because Multer does not disclose or suggest related data elements, Multer necessarily does not disclose or suggest a related data element that affects a layout of an at least one data element. Indeed, Multer does not disclose or suggest affecting a layout of a data element. Furthermore, because the data that is transferred between the systems of Multer

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 19 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

includes only difference information, there cannot be copying of a related data element that affects a layout of an at least one data element to an export data file for transport to a target system.

Additionally, Multer fails to disclose or suggest, as recited in Applicants' amended claim 1, a method that includes copying selected ones of the at least one data element and the related data element to the target database. In particular, Multer fails to disclose or suggest a method that includes copying a related data element that affects a layout of an at least one data element to a target database. As mentioned, Multer does not disclose or suggest related data elements, and in particular does not disclose or suggest a related data element that affects a layout of an at least one data element. Also, the data transferred between systems in Multer includes only the difference information, and System B is then updated using only this difference information. The Office Action contended, in connection with the rejection of claim 5, that Multer discloses a separate database and providing difference information at different points in time. As shown in Fig. 3 of Multer, this separate database is merely a temporary storage area and, importantly, the same difference information, (Col. 6, line 56), is later provided to system B from this temporary storage area. Thus, for reasons discussed above, the data provided to System B does not include a related data element, and more particularly does not include a related data element that affects a layout of an at least one data element.

Neither does Multer render Applicants' amended claim 1 obvious. In particular, Multer teaches away from transporting and copying anything beyond difference information between systems. Multer is motivated by inefficient synchronization schemes that require full bandwidth document or binary file transfer, (Col. 2, lines 45-48), and Multer is specifically directed toward reducing the amount of data transferred between systems. Moreover, users of the systems and methods of Multer would have no reason to expect accessing a related data element from the source database that affects a layout of the at least one data element, transporting the related data element, and copying it to the target database because the data entities of Multer are single-level and do not have defined dependencies on other data elements. Indeed, the operating environments are completely different: Multer concerns synchronizing personal information,

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 20 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

while Applicants' disclosure is directed to business data environments and the complex relationships between data elements that may be defined in such environments.

Thus, at least for the reasons outlined above, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 defines subject matter that is patentable over Multer, as do dependent claims 2 and 6-7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejections of these claims.

Independent claims 8 and 15 have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1, and dependent claims 10, 13, and 19-20 have been amended for consistency with the amended independent claims. For example, independent claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of original dependent claims 9, 11 and 12, and to clarify the nature of the relationship between the related data element and the at least one data element. Independent claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of original dependent claims 17 and 18, and to clarify the nature of the relationship between the related data element and the at least one data element. These amendments add no new matter. For the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 1, Applicants submit that independent claims 8 and 15 each define subject matter that is patentable over Multer, as do dependent claims 10, 13, and 19-20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejections of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected dependent claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer in view of Yuen (U.S. Patent No. 5,423,033). Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 1 defines subject matter that is patentable over Multer. Yuen, either alone or in combination with Multer, fails to cure the deficiencies of Multer. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 defines subject matter that is patentable over Multer in view of Yuen, as does dependent claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner withdraw the anticipation rejection of claim 4.

Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 21 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10, 13-16, and 19-20 are in condition for allowance, and ask that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance for these claims.

Applicants also request that the Patent Office consider the references that were submitted in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 31, 2006, and further request that an initialed copy of the corresponding PTO-1449 form be returned with the next communication from the Patent Office.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Applicant : Ankur Bhatt, et al.
Serial No. : 10/699,170
Filed : October 31, 2003
Page : 22 of 22

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-121001/2003P00232 US01

Examiner is authorized to charge 1,020 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee to deposit account 06-1050. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 16, 2006


Matthew J. Smyth
Reg. No. 58,224

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60352276.doc

Page 1 of 8
Appl. No.: 10/699,170
Amendment in Reply to Office action of April 14, 2006
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s)

1/8




FIG. 1

Page 2 of 8
 Appl. No.: 10/699,170
 Amendment in Reply to Office action of April 14, 2006
 Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s)

2/8

Export Manager Interface 16

Mobile System Maintenance

- Cross-Component Settings
- Sales Transaction Settings
- Document Generation
- Advanced Selection
- Activity Journal Definition
- Territory Management
- Selections and Target Groups
- BW Report Tools
- Employees
- Mobile Services
- Business Content Provider
- Report Maintenance
- Charts
- Export-Import
- **Export Manager** 31
- Import Manager 33
- Business Partner Settings

Export Search 32

Export Entry Type: Business Content Provider

Search 34 Clear 36

Export Entity List 42

Select	Entity Name	Entity Unique Key
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupBSP	57DA81E2C6A4FC15A
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupBSP	21F94524B8CA436384
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	4D3F8D2C87B94C8D8
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	5CD0D921CEB94E38A
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	03E5A9C1C3E449E7E
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	FE832D7E20747E5B
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	648599C3D3B74245AE
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	DDC8323658FD43C8B4
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	FC59C452C13E469882
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	4D8891A7B1A4E02B
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	02D6E806C771495998
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	C14520FCEA554D11A
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	3B48D155DA574FD8
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	5EA614867E547C6
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	DDC5D3D623AC400F87
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	C88C563CDA3F432B4
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	8CA984D9889E49BC80
<input type="checkbox"/>	BhupWednesday	D2C3D54683A848D19

My Export Basket

Export Operation	Entity Name	Entity Type
*Insert/Update	Activity Pile	Charts
Insert/Update	CPActivityC	Charts
Insert/Update	CPActivityC	Business Content
Insert/Update	CPActivityC	Business Content
Insert/Update	CPActivityC	Business Content

Reference Export CAR File 53

Reference Car File Path: Show Entities 55

51

52

54

56

60

62

64

38/65+ INS

FIG. 2

Page 5 of 8
Appl. No.: 10/699,170
Amendment in Reply to Office action of April 14, 2006
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s)

5/8




FIG. 5

Page 6 of 8
 Appl. No.: 10/699,170
 Amendment in Reply to Office action of April 14, 2006
 Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s)

6/8

Import Manager Interface — 24

Mobile System Maintenance

- Cross-Component Settings
- Sales Transaction Settings
- Document Generation
- Advanced Selection
- Activity Journal Definition
- Territory Management
- Selections and Target Groups
- BW Report Tools
- Employees
- Mobile Service
- Business Content Provider
- Report Maintenance
- Charts
- Export-Import — 31
- **Export Manager** — 35
- **Import Manager**
- Business Partner Settings

Import Manager — 80

Export Data File Path: C:\Export\Import\Performance\New\Export Demo

Get Entities — 82

Import Entities — 83

Selected	Entity Name	Entity Type	Operation	Entity Unique Key
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CPActivityC	Charts	Insert/Update	5E8407B2F43A4547B8A77FBAD29EE4
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CPActivityC	Business Content Provider	Insert/Update	60017D086C984B29A0C1C15F4C038E
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BPActivityC	Business Content Provider	Insert/Update	03E6A5C1C5FF4B7B0806822A84D
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	BPActivityP	Business Content Provider	Insert/Update	FE892DFE2D7F47E68C96613FB1E9B
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CPActivityP	Business Content Provider	Insert/Update	07D88C86610840078F4D68AE9E1FD

Select All — 98 **Deselect All** — 100 **Filter Entities** — 99 **Reset Filter** — 103 **Backup Entities** — 101 **Import** — 102

FIG. 6

Page 8 of 8
Appl. No.: 10/699,170
Amendment in Reply to Office action of April 14, 2006
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s)

8/8

IMPORT METHODOLOGY




FIG. 8